

-----Original Message-----

From: Gordon Lund [mailto:gflund@msn.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 20, 2006 2:20 PM
To: Prevetti, Laurel
Cc: Dave Cortese; Gordon Lund
Subject: College Property Use Suggestion

September 19, 2006

Laurel Prevetti, Deputy Director of Planning
Planning, Building and Code Enforcement
City of San Jose, CA

Dear Ms Prevetti,

As I indicated by phone, I may be unable to attend either the September 25th and 27th EEHVS Taskforce meetings. I do, however, want to have additional input to the Task Force in regard to the college property development because the grocery store issue has become increasingly prominent.

In principle, I am uncomfortable with the idea of public lands and institutions engaging in commercial ventures not directly related to their primary mission or to create such an independent revenue source mainly for additional support. I am very much opposed to this idea when there is direct competition with private businesses. Such is the case here. Without further elaboration about the pros and cons of this subject, I would like to place on the table an alternative suggestion for consideration that I feel is a more appropriate use of public owned college land rather than further commercial development.

Some of the discussion around the list of amenities concerns the location of the larger complexes, such as, large sports facilities and fields, a major aquatic center, etc. The college property seems an ideal location for these kinds of amenities. They would be well separated from surrounding neighborhoods and thus avoid concerns of "Not in My Back Yard" as has been expressed. Such facilities could serve well both college programs and community needs, and could be developed around the concept of a "Wellness Center" which has been a popular idea for a number of colleges and communities around the country. The college location is also ideal for maintaining security of such facilities through the local campus police. Parking facilities already exists and might be more easily expanded at the campus than perhaps at other suggested locations. There are no land acquisition costs, and land "set-a-sides" does not substantially compete with housing development contributions to the amenities pool; that is, the college site is not a major contributor to those amenities funds. Various financing mechanisms, via city contributions, usage fees, and community wide financing districts might even be set up to generate additional income to the college and thus negate some of the motivation for added commercial development there. I find few negatives about this suggestion from either a community or from the college perspective, and I would hope the taskforce might consider this suggestion as something that could be made viable and put forward to both City Council and College District.

Again, should I be unable to attend the upcoming meetings, I would appreciate if you would read this brief statement into the taskforce records. Thank you.

Respectfully,

Gordon Lund, EEHVS Taskforce Member